Language Trg file

Preface to Briefing of DDs on Language Development Program

1. The credibility of a foreign-oriented agency is
    based to a degree on its foreign language skill.
    To a greater and lesser degree this applies to
    each of the Directorates.

2. I have good news for you — as they say today —

    It is that there is a new awareness of the need
    for language skills in the Agency.

3. The bad news —

    We are losing more skills than we are gaining.
    The five percent (5%) native level we will not
    replace (to any great degree) again. Unless a
    very concerted effort is made. Even the 4 level
    (fluent) is a difficult goal to be achieved in
    training.

Deputy Directors Briefing
The Language Development Program

I. Introduction: A Brief History

    A. DCI signed Working Group Paper on CIA Language Program: Feb 1966

        1. Summary of Findings

            a. Same as before, notably 1960 IG Survey.
            b. A widespread lack of essential discipline in management of program.
            c. Lack of discipline stemmed from two notable defects:

                (1) Obvious lack of specificity which blurred intent of policies and sidestepped detailed guidelines necessary for effective administration.
                (2) Failure to provide adequately for centralized monitoring and staff supervision of conduct of the program.

        2. Example of Lack of Specificity:

STATINTL

            a. The Testing Program: ███████ provided that staff personnel who claim any degree of knowledge of a foreign language are required to have their proficiency evaluated through Agency tests." However, no time limit is set within which such tests must be taken or retaken and no one is charged with responsibility for seeing that it gets done, except the Director of Personnel in the case of new employees entering on duty. Perhaps it should not be too surprising, therefore, that as of 31 December 1964, according to the Office of Personnel, only 34% of the skills recorded in CIA's Foreign Language Inventory had been tested, and at least two-thirds of the proficiency records — self-appraised as well as tested — had been filed prior to 1962.

            b. The Working Group recommended: A vigorous overhaul of the Agency's testing program and Foreign Language Inventory are clearly in order.

            We did just this.

3. 1966 in Summary

    a. An unreliable data base: no real notion of skills.

    b. No language positions: some tested, some claimed, some not recorded at all.

    c. No centralized monitoring — Importance of this. (If it has leeway to go wrong it will — in this program.)

    d. A Language School attuned to a non-program.

4. LDC Constituted: Action to overcome vagueness:

    a. To overcome lack of specificity, rewrote the Language Regulation — fixing responsibility in each area of concern.

    b. In testing — I insisted and the LDC:

        (1) Agreed to base the Agency's program on tested capabilities only.

        (2) Launched a vigorous program to clean up all untested claims.

            (a) 5,284 plus tested since Jan 68.

            (b) August 1969: 4,263 claims still pending.

            (c) As of June 1971 — 1,502.

            (d) 1972: 1,000 claims outstanding. From skills, claims, disclaims of 11,608: over 5,000 tested.

    c. Computerized Data Base.

    d. Launched intensive testing program.

    e. Established language positions and procedures for reporting. Set up for computerized monitoring.

    f. Wrote Incentive Regulation. Rewrote Incentive Regulation.

    g. Reported annually to DCI.

B. Current Language Capability (as of May 72) 4,082 usable skills ("2" or better) (career agents and contract employees not included)

C. Essential Elements of the LDP

1. The identification of positions requiring a language skill.

2. A reliable, tested roster of skills.

3. An effective monitoring system of language-positions and matching skills.

4. A determination of needs projected over a reasonable time span. We can tell you precisely what you have tested — only you know what is needed.

5. A training-recruitment program to add new skills.

6. THE SINE QUA NON: CONSISTENT TOTAL BACKING OF TOP MANAGEMENT.

   Summary:
   a. This is a tough problem.   ) I am convinced centralized monitoring
   b. There can be no relaxation.) still the only answer.
   c. Learning languages is not as   (1) Consistent pressure to get
      costly as it seems: people tested.
                                   (2) Requirements: Easy to forget.

      (1) A soft language (French) — 28 weeks to achieve
          2+ to 3 level   ----------------------- ca $ 5,000

          Salary based on GS-12, middle step -------- ca   +9,000
                                                          $14,000
      (2) For a hard language (Russian) ------------- ca   8,000
          Plus Salary ------------------------------- ca +13,800
                                                          $22,000

D. The Trend: Losses and gains of usable skills in CY 71

   1. Losses: 251
   2. Gains: 238

      a. Gain through recruitment   75
      b. Gain through training (LS)   134
      c. Gain through other means   29 *
         (including overseas training)
                             Total   238

   3. Inventory of Speaking Skills in 47 Languages: May 70 to May 72

      a. Losses   18
      b. Gains   17
      c. No Changes   12
               Total   47

   4. CY 72: Trend will continue. OSS personnel with 4 and 5 level
      skill. Should stabilize by about 1977.

   * Note: Figure of 29—we consider this significant and tends to bear out
            very limited findings abroad and now is flatly stated by GAO study.

II. The Role of the Directorates in Setting Goals

A. The LDC has recognized that:

1. Each Directorate has distinct needs.
2. Each Directorate needs latitude to define its own role and write its own rules. Therefore, Agency regulation provides broad guidelines.

B. What Are Proper Goals?

1. Individual language skills: career lifetime

a. Two languages at the 3 level: State's goal.
b. Variations of this: a world language at the 3 level and at one time in each career use of a hard language at the 3 level.
c. One language at the 3 level before promotion to ?_____.
d. No acceptance in a Directorate without a skill or certified aptitude.
e. Establishment of minimum language skill before going overseas.
f. Tying of language skill as element in career progression.
g. "Courtesy" level skill for wife.

2. Identification of positions requiring a language skill

a. How many positions in a unit?
b. This must be a living thing—changing: Now we have this as goal—not hard requirement.
c. Which positions.
d. At what level: S-3 for DDP, DDS and R-3 for DDI.
e. All specific:

See Charts: Exhibit 1 for identification of position breakdown and Agency breakdown.
Exhibit 2: Also CS —% of positions filled: 1971-72.

3. Keeping students in training long enough to achieve meaningful goal: 90% stay for contract — 2 weeks to 11 months; 90% do not finish prescribed courses of instructions — 28-44 weeks.

4. Long-range projection to assure skill in rarest hard languages: Could be years of study. (Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Arabic)

5. No untested skills.

4

III. Inclusion of LDP in PDP: To assure time for training.

IV. The Language Control Register: (Exhibit #3)

    A. An invaluable management tool.

        The LCR is Job #140-H: Lists by:

            Directorate
            Component
            By language unit the required level of language skill for the
             position plus the capability of the incumbent.
            Also, it lists by name, position, and language skill level any
             other employee in the language unit with a skill in a language
             required by the unit.
            Now published monthly: changing to quarterly.

    B. See Exhibit #3 for Jobs $161-A and Job #040-A.

    C. When the new computer system is in effect—there will be: The
        number of employees· by position and the number of skills in each
        language unit—this will be "Our STATION BY STATION report."
        The other run will be a report on the incentive program—presently
        we do both of these by hand count.

V. The Loss of Skills in "hard" languages: this will continue. Exhibit #6

    A. Losses: In Albanian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Lithuanian,
        Norwegian, Polish, Slovak, and Ukrainian. Fr - 6; Ger 29
        (4 & 5 level — 26) Italian 3
        Note: Only two of these languages are taught by OTR and probably not
        taught in many places in the U. S. Recruitment of speakers of these
        is neglibible—losses will continue unchecked.

    B. Gains: Arabic +10; Finnish +1; Danish +3; Hindi +2; Indonesian +4;
        Lao +14; Latvian +3; Persian +5; Portugese +7; Romanian +1, Spanish +11;
        Swedish +2; Thai +15; Turkish +6; Vietnamese +2; Russian +16 at 5 and 4
        level, gained 11 at 1 and 2 level. Note: % is probably due to getting tested.

        SEE ATTACHMENT E of 21 July 72 Annual Report (Exhibit 6)

C. <u>Replacement of Losses:</u> DDs must identify needs.

    1. Pin-pointed recruitment.
    2. Special training.
    3. Overseas residence for select few.
    4. CTs: See Exhibit #4.

VI. <u>The Incentive Program</u> (Exhibit #5)

    A. Number in program : about 200.
    B. Lao leads with 51 enrolled.
    C. Other gains: Arabic, Lao, Persian, Turkish, and Thai.
    D. As of July 72 — $42,600 paid out.

VII. <u>Early Withdrawal:</u> To point out need — see Station by Station — Annual Report.

    A. One problem overcome: withdrawal short of contract.
    B. Now: withdrawal at end of contract.
    C. Office of Personnel to incorporate LDP in their annual Personnel Development Program (PDP): Thus assure time for training.

VIII. The GAO Findings: Summary (1. We were interviewed —not included.
                                     (2. May result in additional legislation.
                                     (3. In long run we will probably be affected.

STATINTL   A. Questions overseas effectiveness —studying outside of FSI schools, etc.
    B. Up-grading—███████ report: language skill not necessarily improved by service abroad.

IX. <u>Conclusions</u>

    A. <u>We have tools of good LDP.</u>

        1. Sound regulatory guidance.
        2. Sound Data Base.
        3. An excellent Language School.
        4. A sound incentive program.
        5. A new emphasis on the need for language skills.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

B. <u>What We Need.</u>

   1. Individual goals: tying language skill to career progression.
   2. Language position goals.
   3. A long-term projection of skills needed.

      a. A training program.
      b. A recruitment program.

X. <u>References</u>

   A. Exhibit #6: CIA officers with tested S/3
                    CS - State Officers with tested S/3

   B. Exhibit #7: Inventory of Trends